DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 759 CE 004 567

AUTHOR Haveman, Jacqueline E.
TITLE Phase A: The CCEM Acceptability Studies.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 6p.; For related documents, see CE 004 565-566 and CE 004 568; Paper presented to American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; Educational Research; Feasibility Studies; *Models; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS CCEM; *Comprehensive Career Education Model

ABSTRACT

The first phase of the American Institutes for Research (AIR) activity in the revision of 61 curriculum units of the Comprehensive Career Education Model (CCEM) project focused on obtaining information that would aid in revising the units to meet the needs of publishers, school administrators, and teachers. Three separate acceptability studies were carried out to obtain reactions to the first CCEM materials: an in-depth review of the materials by classroom teachers in a workshop setting; a review of the sample units by school administrators; and a review by publishers who have an interest in career education materials. A common set of review materials consisting of three sampler units and evaluation forms was used in all three studies. Results of the studies confirmed the presence of a high interest in career education and should lend direction to the planning of the next steps. (SA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110759

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Phase A: The CCEM Acceptability Studies

Jacqueline E. Haveman
American Institutes for Research

This report presents an outline of the first phase of activity of the CCEM project. The general purpose of this phase was to obtain information that would aid us in revising the units to meet the needs of publishers, school administrators, and teachers. At the completion of our project, these three groups would ultimately be responsible for the publication, adoption, and utilization of the CCEM curriculum units.

To obtain the desired information we carried out three separate acceptability studies in which we obtained reactions to the first CCEM materials. The first study consisted of an in-depth review of the materials by classroom teachers; the second of a review of the sample units by school administrators; and the third of a review by publishers who have an interest in career education materials. A common set of review materials consisting of three Sampler units and evaluation forms was used in all three studies. However, we used a slightly different approach in each study so that we could obtain additional information (other than reactions to the Samplers) useful in planning our project activities.

Teacher Workshops

To obtain teachers' reactions, we held two 2-day teacher workshops at AIR. One workshop covered the elementary units (K-6) and the other the junior and senior high units. We decided on a workshop approach because it would enable us to obtain evaluations not only of the Sampler but also the entire set of CCEM units appropriate for the workshop grade range. In our previous career education project we had worked closely with a group of teachers who had gained experience in developing and using infusable career education materials. The teachers who had demonstrated the greatest expertise in this area were selected for our workshops.

The pattern of the two workshops was the same. First, the appropriate Sampler was evaluated. Then, the teachers selected other units in the curriculum for individual review and evaluation; finally, a large group evaluation-

CE004567

discussion was held over the complete set of materials for the grade ranges. Results were obtained by an analysis of the individual Unit Evaluation Guides and a content analysis of the discussion-evaluation sessions.

I'd like to describe the school district survey before discussing any results because I think the results of the teacher and school district survey are more easily discussed together.

School District Survey

The second way in which we obtained acceptability data was to ask school district administrators across the continental United Stated to evaluate the three Sample Units. The survey sample consisted of the two groups: the first was a .5% random sample of all operating K-12 school districts (a total of 54) and the second was the 13 largest school districts in the United States (this group represents the 10 largest cities and the 10 largest districts).

In addition to obtaining reactions to the units, the purpose of this survey was to assess the level of interest in career education. We understood that adoption of the CCEM materials would depend on local school administrators' interest in implementing career education.

In carrying out this survey, we used a somewhat atypical survey procedure. After obtaining our sample, we phoned the district superintendent or chief curriculum officer in each district explaining the purpose of the study and soliciting his or her cooperation. We explained that the superintendent could appoint an appropriate administrator to evaluate a particular Sampler. We wanted the district evaluators to review a unit and then call us in Palo Alto for a telephone interview in which they could give us their more informal reactions. Evaluators could call our office any time during the hours 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. their time. This meant that we had to have someone in our office on the West Coast at 5:00 a.m. so that we could get East Coast calls. When a phone call from an evaluator was received, after obtaining the first initial reactions, we had a standard list of questions around which the conversation was oriented. In addition to the calls, we also requested Unit Evaluation Guides and School District Information from each district. These, then, were the three basic sets of data for analysis.

Our response rate using this procedure was quite high in the relatively short time we had of only about three weeks. It was necessary for us to call some of the districts to remind them of the deadline dates of the survey. We received some information from over 90% of the districts. In 2/3 of these districts, career education was emphasized in grades 10-12. A small majority (just over 50%) felt their career education would increase next year, while just over 40% felt it would remain the same. The present high interest in career education was evident from the fact that over 90% of the total sample (i.e., virtually all respondents) indicated an interest in participation in future testing of the units.

Results

As I indicated previously in terms of their reaction to the Sampler, the results of these two surveys were quite similar.

1) The units elicited very positive responses over the substance of the activities. The curriculum emphasis on activity was well liked.

2) Teachers were particularly positive about the teacher guide with accompanying reproduction masters approach. They expressed the need to keep costs of the units as low as possible. Administrators, of course, felt this way also.

3) Teachers, more than administrators, were concerned about the relatively rigid structure which limited teacher flexibility in providing for student individual differences.

4) On the other hand, administrators were more concerned that the units might not be infused easily into existing curriculum and might require additional teacher training.

5) Both groups felt that the units should be shorter. Short units are more easily infused and do not appear to be a formidable teaching task.

6) The school administrators were also a bit more concerned than the teachers that the units be more colorful, lively, attractive--although this was a concern of the teachers also.

7) The teachers had the opportunity to study and evaluate all the units in the curriculum. They had more favorable opinions of units that had obvious career education content and dealt with self understanding or value clarification.

Publisher Survey

Our final acceptability study involved a series of intensive discussions with publishers who have a current or potential interest in career education materials. The object of this survey was not only to assess publisher's evaluations of the CCEM materials, but also to obtain suggestions to guide our activities that would maximize the publishability of the CCEM materials.

Thirty-one publishers were initially contacted by a member of the AIR staff. These 31 were selected from a pool of publishers who had originally requested the CCEM materials RFP last spring, or already have career education materials on the market, or who had an interest in experimental materials. Only seven of this group when contacted indicated no interest in discussing the project.

Appointments were made for interviews with key staff from 15 of the 24 publishers indicating interest in the project. We surveyed the publishers through personal interviews in order to demonstrate the CCEM materials and to appraise the publisher's interest in career education.

All of the publishers we contacted expressed a strong interest in career education, but many were uncertain as to the strength of interest of public school personnel. Many of them also expressed interest in maintaining contact with the project. Several publishers offered to serve on a publishers' advisory board to AIR during the life of the project. They were unanimous in recommending to us that the development of student consumable materials would increase the attractiveness of the units to publishers. They were also in unanimous agreement that a publisher (whomever it may be) should be involved in the project before the units are revised and field tested.

Conclusion and Summary

After careful consideration of the results from these three studies, we, on the project staff, recommend to NIE that the most effective strategy for preparing these units for publication would be first to revise the units thoroughly and then nationally field test them during the 1975-76 academic year. Dr. McLeod, the next presentor, will outline our revision plans. It was also apparent to us that we had to make an effort to involve a publisher as soon as possible so that AIR and the publisher can work together in the revision process. For this reason, we have already issued an RFP through Publishers Alert. The NIE has agreed with our recommendations.

These, then, were our acceptability studies. They confirmed to us and the NIE that there is a high interest in career education. Perhaps, more importantly, these studies reinforced us in our feelings that there is a great deal of potential for the CCEM materials to provide a much desired and needed thrust in American education.